

Honnehally—Siddeswara Road.

* Q.—467. Sri D. S. NADAKARNI (Ankola).—

Will the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state :—

(a) when the Honnehally-Siddeswara Road was taken over by P.W.D ;

(b) (i) the number of bridges on this road ; and
(ii) the number of them that were broken ;

(c) the width of the said Road ;

(d) whether this is not the only road for 8 villages of this part which joins the Hebbulla—Sanekatha Road ?

A.—Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation) [on behalf of SRI VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works)].

(a) 6th October 1965.

(b) (i) Eight.

(ii) One.

(c) 8ft. to 13 ft.

(d) This road serves seven villages.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಡಕರ್ಣಿ.—ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊನ್ನೇಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸಿದ್ದೇಶ್ವರ ರಸ್ತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಟು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿದು ಹೋಗಿರುವವು ಒಂದು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅರ್ಧ ಅಗಿರುವವು ಎಷ್ಟು, ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲು ಅಗಿರುವವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮತ್ತು ತೂತು ಬಿದ್ದಿರುವವು ಎಷ್ಟು ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಅಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ರೋಡೋಪಾಯಿಂಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರಿದು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಂಥ ಸೇತುವೆಯನ್ನು ತಕ್ಷಣ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಡಕರ್ಣಿ.—ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಗಲ 8 ರಿಂದ 13 ಅಡಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೋಡ್ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫೋರ್ಮ ಬಸ್ಸುಗಳು ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಬತ್ತದ ಗದ್ದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡಿ ಜಮೀನು ಬಡಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಆ ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಶಾಲ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಡಕರ್ಣಿ.—ಸ್ಯಾಮಿ, ತುಂಬಾ ಕಾಡುಪ್ರದೇಶವಾದ ಉತ್ತರಕನ್ನಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿದೆ. ಈ ರಸ್ತೆ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಜಾಗೃತ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಲೂರು ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ.—ಕೆಲವು ಅಪ್ಪಿಜಿಷನ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಆದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

— — —

Mr. SPEAKER.—Questions 281 and 299 are held over as the Minister is not present.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. There is no provision under the Rules of Procedure where a question can be held over for the absence of the Minister concerned, especially when there are colleagues of his to answer. Otherwise, it may lead to a very unhealthy precedent. So often the Chief Minister is absent and his various colleagues have answered for him. If we say that because a question is listed in the name of a particular Minister that Minister alone will have to be present to answer it, it will be creating a precedent and the question standing in the name of a Minister will have to be held over until that Minister is in the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—A point of order is raised saying that there is no rule which enables a question being held over under the circumstances which now prevail. But the hon'ble Member forgets that the discretion rests with the Speaker. The rule is explicit and clear. If a Member makes a request, I am bound to apply my mind to it. I do not know the contents of either the question or of the supplementaries that are likely to be put. Therefore, if a Member makes a request, I am bound to entertain it and apply my mind. Perhaps the special knowledge which the Minister for Public Works has, his colleagues may not have. In such circumstances, if a Member makes a request there is no breach of any rule and if there is no breach of rule there is no point of order.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have also raised another point. There are a large number of questions that have been tabled and if we take the number of days on which we meet it will be hardly possible for all the questions to come up here for oral answers. In view of this, if any questions are held over, it will curtail the privilege of another hon'ble Member whose question would otherwise have come up for oral answers. Thus, we may lose our right.

MR. SPEAKER.—It is a matter of convenience and not a breach of any rule because no rule provides that a particular question must be taken up on a particular day. I can very well understand the inconvenience that might be caused, but I do not think it amounts to a violation of a rule or the violation of a privilege. Hereafter I will be careful when members make a request that a particular question may not be taken up on a day on which it is not convenient to him. All along when Ministers were not present, in the past on several occasions I have held over questions. For the absence of a Minister a Member is not responsible. If a Minister is absent some other Minister can answer and if that some other Minister and the Member desire that the question should be taken up on some other day, I do not think there is breach of any rule. The inconvenience that is likely to be caused is so unprecise. That this is likely to displace the question of another Member is no right. We do not know how many questions are ready for answer. We do not know on how many days they will be taken up. So, I will be careful when requests are made by Members in future. I am unable to entertain the point of order. Next question.